

## **II. REMARKS:**

### **A. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-14 were originally filed with the application. All claims were rejected in an Office Action mailed February 22, 2002. In a Response mailed on May 9, 2002, claims 1-7 were cancelled and claim 9 was amended. The remaining claims, claims 8-14, were rejected in a Final Office Action mailed August 27, 2002. Claim 8 was amended in a Response mailed on October 24, 2002. An Advisory Action was mailed on December 4, 2002, in which it was stated that the amendment to claim 8 was not entered because it raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. It was also stated in the Advisory Action that the proposed amendment would be entered upon the filing of an appeal. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) was filed on January 20, 2003. Claims 8-14 were pending at the time of an Action mailed February 13, 2003. Claims 11-14 were cancelled, claim 8 was amended and claims 15-26 were added in a Response mailed August 12, 2003.

Claims 8-10 and 15-21 are rejected in the present Office Action. Claims 22-26 have been withdrawn by the examiner as being directed to a subject matter which was not presented originally. Applicant reserves the right to re-file claims 22-26 in a continuation application. Claims 8 and 10 are amended herein and claim 9 is cancelled herein. Support for the amendment to claim 8 is found in the specification and in claim 9 as originally filed. The amendment to claim 10 simply corrects the dependency of claim 10 after cancellation of claim 9.

**B. The Claims are Enabled**

The Action rejects claims 8-10 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Action asserts that the phrase "one or more non-peptide neurotrophic factor stimulators" in the claims is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The Action acknowledges that the specification discloses examples of structures of some compounds within the scope of what is claimed but takes the position that there is not enough explanation to encompass the full scope of the phrase. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Notwithstanding Applicant's traversal of the rejection, it is pointed out that claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the specific non-peptide neurotrophic factor stimulators listed in claim 9 in order to clarify the subject matter of the claims. It is believed that the amendments to the claims address the examiner's concerns.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the written description rejection be withdrawn.


**C. Conclusion**

This is submitted to be a complete response to the outstanding Action. Based on the foregoing arguments, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance; a notice of allowability is therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 09/856,987 (Conf. No. 6461)  
Filed: May 25, 2001  
Page 5

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (817) 551-4321 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Teresa J. Schultz  
Reg. No. 40,526  
Attorney for Applicants

ALCON RESEARCH, LTD.  
6201 S. Freeway, Q-148  
Fort Worth, TX 76134-2099  
(817) 551-4321

Date: 12 April 2004